lose their outward appearance, I suspect that they retain subtle indications of their true nature. If we knew the characteristics of allegory, we might discover their presence in modern versions. Dähnhardt, for example, finds references to sensuality in versions having no trace of an allegorical use. This would seem to suggest that the Tarbaby story was originally allegorical, but it may be possible to explain them in some other way.

We might, on the other hand, examine stories which have acquired an allegorical significance and identify their peculiarities. If such stories behave in ways that are akin to the peculiarities of the Tarbaby versions having allegorical meaning, then we should have established their origin. We know that Buddhist monks imposed an allegorical interpretation on some folktales. If we knew more about their methods we might recognize them in the early versions of the Tarbaby story.

These remarks on the fundamentally allegorical or non-allegorical quality of the Tarbaby story become more important in the light of Reitzenstein's derivation[9] of the story from a Manichaean myth of Ormuzd, who attacks Death (Matter, Evil) with his five members or weapons and is caught. Reitzenstein contends that the theme is ultimately Iranian in origin.

An observation[10] made by Gédéon Huet suggests the second point which I wish to make. He contends that stories passing from a higher to a lower culture change human actors to animal actors. The circumstances in which this change occurs are quite obscure. He cites several examples in African tales. It may be characteristic of certain African narrators, but I shall not venture to offer any generalizations on the subject. There is a striking example in European narrative that Huet does not cite. The old story of the Division of the Crops, which is appropriate to human actors (a man and the Devil), is also told of the fox and the wolf. Other examples could no doubt be found. If we knew the history and currency of this change, we might be able to interpret its appearance in the Tarbaby story.

The discussion of the Tarbaby story seems likely to illuminate difficulties and unexplored corners in the nature of popular narrative far more important than the very strange history of a tale. I look forward to more light on the subject.

[9] *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift*, 1924, pp. 8-11. Cited from Maenchen 556, n. 16.

[10] *Les contes populaires* 129 (Paris, n. d.).

THE EPIC OF GILGAMEŠ AND ITS SUMERIAN SOURCES

A STUDY IN LITERARY EVOLUTION

S. N. KRAMER

UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, PHILADELPHIA

FROM THE POINT of view of human interest and dramatic impact, the Epic of Gilgameš is outstanding and unique in Babylonian literature. In such compositions as Enûma eliš (the Babylonian Epic of Creation), The Song of Irra, and Ištar's Descent to the Nether World (the Babylonian counterpart of the Sumerian poem Inanna's Descent to the Nether World), it is the Babylonian gods who hold the center of the stage, gods who, on the whole, tend to represent abstractions rather than personalities, personified intellectualizations, rather than profound spiritual forces. Even in such tales as Adapa and the South Wind, and Etana and the Plant of Birth, where the main protagonists seem to be mortal men, the role they play is mechanical and impersonal; it is completely lacking in dramatic vigor. Adapa and Etana are bloodless, colorless, creatures whose puppet-like movements serve the purpose of the highly stylized aetiological myth.

The situation is quite different with respect to the Epic of Gilgameš. In this poem it is man who holds the center of the stage—the man Gilgameš, who loves and hates, weeps and rejoices, strives and wearies, hopes and despairs. True, the gods are not absent; indeed Gilgameš, himself, in accordance with the mythologic patter and pattern of the times, is described as two-thirds divine, and

one-third mortal. But it is Gilgameš as man who dominates the action of the poem; the gods and their activities serve but as background and setting for the dramatic episodes in the hero's life. What gives these episodes lasting significance and universal appeal, is their *human* quality; they revolve about forces and problems common to man everywhere through the ages. The need for friendship, the instinct for loyalty, the impelling urge for fame and name, the love of adventure and achievement, the all-absorbing fear of death, and the all compelling longing for immortality — it is the varied interplay of these emotional and spiritual drives in man which constitutes the drama of the Epic of Gilgameš, drama which transcends the confines of time and space. Little wonder that the influence of this poem on the ancient epic literatures was as wide as it was deep.[1] Even to-day the attentive reader will not fail to be profoundly moved by the universal sweep of its action, and by the elemental power of its tragedy. Spiritually and psychologically, at least, the modern reader will find himself not so very far apart from his Babylonian brother who lived thousands of years ago.

Let me now proceed to outline the contents of the epic;[2] even this brief sketch should prove not unrevealing of its interest and appeal. The poem begins with a short introductory passage in praise

[1] There are some indications that the influence of the Epic of Gilgameš reached not merely the ancient Near East and Greece but penetrated considerably beyond these lands. We are all familiar, at least by title, with Peter Jensen's *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur* (vol. 1, Strassburg, 1906; vol. 2, Marburg, 1928), in which the noted scholar attempts to trace in some detail the influence of the Babylonian poem on the epic literature of the world. His method and procedure seem rather dangerous to the less biased; the imagination is fecund, and the effective controls, because of the very nature of the problems involved, are only too few. Many of his parallels seem far-fetched, and not infrequently betray their hot-house origin. Nevertheless these volumes may prove to be more significant than is generally assumed; the condemnation of Jensen's method and conclusions has perhaps been far too widespread and much too harsh. It is not irrelevant to bear in mind that to his last days, Jensen's Assyriological writings reveal the master's hand both in method and content. There may well come a day when at least some of his conclusions concerning the Epic of Gilgameš and its widespread influence will be corroborated by the uncovering of new data or by a deeper insight into the relevant material long known.

[2] Very roughly speaking, about half of the Epic of Gilgameš, whose full text (even without the so-called 'twelfth' tablet) consisted of over three thousand lines, is now available. As in the case of Enûma eliš (cf. my review of Alexander Heidel's *The Babylonian Genesis* in *JAOS* 63. 69 ff.) the major source material for the restoration of the text of the Babylonian epic consists of tablets excavated in Ašurbanipal's library at Nineveh by the British Museum expeditions between 1848-76. Again as in the case of Enûma eliš, it is George Smith to whom we owe the identification, arrangement, and translation of many of the texts belonging to the epic. Following Smith, the leading figures are Paul Haupt and Peter Jensen. The former prepared, in the years 1884-90, the first edition of all the British Museum texts then known as belonging to the poem. The latter published in 1900, a volume containing the transliteration and translation of all the then known Babylonian epics and myths, a contribution which marked a milestone in the progress of Assyriology (for the bibliographical details of the works mentioned in these and the following lines, cf. the excellent résumé in the introduction to Campbell Thompson's *The Epic of Gilgamish* [Oxford, 1930]; this publication will be referred to as *EG* in the course of our study).

In the decades that followed, numerous new texts belonging to the epic were uncovered and published by various scholars; some of these texts, significantly enough, were excavated at Boghaz Keui, in central Anatolia, and are inscribed not only in Accadian, but also in Hittite and Hurrian. Other fragments were uncovered in Ašur and Erech. But by far the most important addition to epic, consisted of three tablets inscribed in the Old Babylonian period which date from the first half of the second millennium B. C. Not only did these Old Babylonian tablets help to restore materially some of the missing portions of the epic, they also proved beyond all doubt the early date of its composition. In 1930, appeared Thompson's superb edition of the epic mentioned above, which contains the transliterations of all the available Accadian material, and new composite copies of all the British Museum tablets and fragments, a fitting and crowning contribution by an English scholar to a field of literature whose recovery and restoration owes so much to English enterprise and scholarship. And in 1934, from the pen of Albert Schott, Jensen's most faithful disciple, came the fullest and most trustworthy translation of the epic, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos* (Leipzig).

The very latest translation of the epic is F. M. Th. Böhl's *Het Gilgamesj-Epos* (Amsterdam, 1941). As the author himself readily admits, his work adds very little that is new; his purpose was to achieve for the Dutch reading public what Schott had accomplished for the German. However, by utilizing in an intelligent and scholarly manner the contributions of his predecessors, he has succeeded in producing the most complete translation available to date. (Note, however, that in the matter of the 'twelfth' tablet he failed to draw several pertinent conclusions from my comparative analysis of the corresponding Sumerian material in *AS* 10. 15 ff.). Moreover, at numerous key points in his translation, Böhl intersperses explanatory comments which help to clarify to the layman the plot of the epic, as well as the relevant Babylonian religious and spiritual concepts. Additional comments are to be found among the notes

of Gilgameš and his city Erech.[3] We then read that Gilgameš, the king of Erech, is a restless hero, unrivalled and undisciplined, who tyrannizes over the dwellers of his city; especially oppressive are his unreasonable demands for the satisfaction of his Rabelaisian sex-appetite. The Erechites cry out in anguish to the gods, who, realizing that Gilgameš acts the tyrant and bully because he had still to find his match among his fellow humans, direct the great mother-goddess Aruru to put an end to this intolerable situation. She proceeds to fashion from clay the powerful Enkidu, who, naked and long-haired, and innocent of all human relationship, spends his days and nights with the wild beasts of the plain.[4] It is this Enkidu, more brute than man, who is to subdue Gilgameš's arrogance and discipline his spirit. First, however, Enkidu must be 'humanized,' a process which turns out to be largely woman's task. An Erechite courtesan arouses and satisfies his sex-instincts; as a result he loses in physical stature and brute strength, but gains correspondingly in mental and spiritual size. This sex experience has made Enkidu 'wise'; the wild beasts no longer recognize him as their own. Patiently the woman now proceeds to guide him in the civilized human arts of eating, drinking, and dressing.[5]

The humanized Enkidu is now ready to meet Gilgameš, whose arrogant and tyrannical spirit he is destined to subdue. The latter has already learned in his dreams of the coming of Enkidu. Eager to display his unrivalled position in Erech, he arranged what may perhaps be described as a special nocturnal orgy, and invited Enkidu to attend. The latter, however, is repelled and infuriated by Gilgameš's sexual cravings, and blocks his way in an effort to prevent him from entering the house appointed for the unseemly rendevous. Thereupon the two titans join in combat—Gilgameš, the supersophisticated townsman, and Enkidu, the genuine, simple plainsman.[6] Enkidu seems to be getting the better of his rival, when (for some unstated reason) Gilgameš's wrath leaves him, and the two erstwhile enemies kiss and embrace. Out of this bitter struggle, profoundly enough, is born the friendship of the two heroes, a friendship destined no doubt to become proverbial in world lore, so loyal was it and lasting, so rich in heroic achievement.

But Enkidu is not happy in Erech; its gay, sensual life is making a weakling of him. And so Gilgameš reveals to his friend his adventurous plan to journey to the far-distant cedar-forest, kill the mighty Ḫuwawa, its fearful guardian, fell the cedar tree, and 'destroy all that is evil from the land.'[7] Enkidu, who in his early savage days had wandered freely through this forest, warns Gilgameš of the mortal danger of his proposed undertaking. But Gilgameš only mocks his fears; it is enduring fame and an everlasting name which he longs for, not a prolonged but unheroic existence. He confers with the elders of Erech, obtains the approval of the sun-god Šamaš, the patron of all travellers, and has the craftsmen of Erech cast special and gigantic weapons for himself and

following the translation; these notes also furnish a résumé of the more recent contributions of the preceding scholars to the interpretation of the more difficult and obscure passages. Four plates of pertinent illustrative material add considerably to the appearance of the volume, which is intelligently conceived and excellently adapted to serve the purpose for which it is intended, that is, to present to the Dutch literate layman, a lucid and moving translation of the great Babylonian epic.

[3] The first part of the passage describes Gilgameš as the far-journeying wanderer who endured many hardships and gathered much wisdom. It furnishes an interesting parallel to the introductory lines of Homer's Odyssey, and may possibly represent their prototype. For other parallel stylistic features in the two epics, cf. Ungnad, *Kulturfragen* 4/5 p. 30.

[4] As already noted by Jensen in *Das Gilgamesch-Epos* I 812 ff., Enkidu, with his long, unshorn hair, simple desires, wilderness habitat, and animal company, is the possible prototype of the Biblical Nazirite.

[5] If, as is not impossible, the civilizing process which Enkidu underwent, reflects a Babylonian view of human development in general, the anthropological concepts which it reveals, parallels to a certain extent, those current in modern times. For this view implies the conception that man, when first created, was not a creature fully endowed with all the more important faculties, but rather a brute who, mentally, spiritually, and to a certain extent, even physically, was kin to the wild beasts of the plain. Civilized man, again in accordance with the implications of this view, was conceived as emerging slowly and gradually from a state of savagery; in a very limited sense, therefore, this particular Babylonian view of man's development, may be said to imply an evolutionary approach. Man's mental and spiritual awakening was conceived as coming about in large part through the arousing and satisfying of the sex appetite; his social arts resulted mainly from woman's influence and training. (Note, however, that to date, no Sumerian or Babylonian explanation of the distinction of the sexes has been uncovered).

[7] Just what mythological implications are involved in the felling of the cedar, and what relation, if any, was conceived to exist between that act and the destruction of all evil, is as yet unknown.

Enkidu. Thus prepared, they set out on their adventure. After a long and wearisome journey, they arrive at the dazzlingly beautiful cedar forest, kill Ḫuwawa, and fell the cedar.

Adventure leads to adventure. Upon their return to Erech, Ištar, the goddess of love and lust, becomes infatuated with the well-formed Gilgameš. With the promise of many rich favors she tries to induce Gilgameš to satisfy her desires.[8] But Gilgameš is no longer the undisciplined tyrant of former days. Well aware of her promiscuity and faithlessness, he mocks at her offer and spurns it. Thereupon, Ištar, bitterly disappointed and deeply offended, tries to persuade Anu to send the 'bull of heaven' against Erech to destroy Gilgameš and his city. Anu at first refuses, but when Ištar threatens to bring up the dead from the nether world, he is forced to consent.[9] The 'bull of heaven' descends and begins to lay waste to Erech, slaughtering its warriors by the hundreds. Gilgameš and Enkidu together then take up the struggle against the beast, and in a mighty concerted effort succeed in killing him.[10]

Our two heroes have now reached the pinnacle of their career; the city of Erech rings out with the song of their exalted deeds. At that very moment, climactically enough, inexorable fate brings a sudden and cruel end to their unclouded happiness. Because of his part in killing Ḫuwawa and the 'bull of heaven,' Enkidu was sentenced to premature death by the gods. After a twelve-day illness, Enkidu breathed his last while his friend and companion looked on helplessly, stunned, and besides himself with grief. His anguished spirit was obsessed with but one doubly bitter thought: Enkidu was dead, and sooner or later, he, too, would meet the same fate. He found but little comfort now in the fame and glory of his past heroic deeds. It is tangible, physical immortality which his tormented spirit now craves; he must seek and find the secret of eternal life.

But, as Gilgameš well knew, there was but one individual[11] who, in the course of man's history, had succeeded in obtaining immortality — Utanapištim, the wise and pious king of ancient Šuruppak. He decides, therefore, to make his way at all costs to his distant dwelling place; perhaps that immortalized hero will reveal his precious secret. He wanders long and far, over mountain and plain, ever exposed to wild beast and famine. He crosses the primeval sea and the 'waters of death.' Finally, weary and emaciated, his hair long and shaggy, his naked, filthy body covered with raw animal hides, the once proud ruler of Erech stands before Utanapištim, eager to learn the mystery of eternal life.

But Utanapištim's words are far from encouraging. The immortalized king of Šuruppak narrates at great length the story of the destructive deluge which the gods had once brought against the earth in order to exterminate all its living creatures. He, too, would surely have perished were it not for the sheltering boat which he had built at the advice of the god Ea. As for the gift of eternal life, it was the gods who willed its bestowal upon him; where, however, was the god who willed Gilgameš's immortality?[12] Despairing of his fate, Gilgameš is ready to return empty-handed to Erech, when a ray of hope appears. At the urging of his wife, Utanapištim reveals to him the whereabouts of the plant of eternal youth which lay at the bottom of the sea. Gilgameš dives to the bottom, brings up the plant, and proceeds joyfully to his city Erech. But the gods willed it otherwise. While Gilgameš goes bathing in a well, a snake carries off the plant. Weary and bitterly disappointed, the hero returns to Erech, to find at least partial comfort in its enduring walls.

[8] The psychological clash implicit in the Gilgameš-Enkidu combat, mirrors to a certain extent, the complex interplay of the mutually antagonistic spiritual drives inherent in man and society. In depicting this incident, the epic portrays in poetic and dramatic form, the unceasing struggle between opposing attitudes crystallized from such seemingly irreconcilable behaviour characteristics as sex-craving and sex-discipline, and from such antagonistic social developments as peasant and urban cultures.

[9] Note the somewhat parallel Circe episode in the Odyssey; cf. Ungnad, *Kulturfragen* 4/5 p. 31; Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos* II 197 f.; Gressmann in Gressmann-Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos* 128-9.

[10] Note the parallel case in the Odyssey of Helios's threat to descend to the nether world and give light to the shades of the departed; cf. Ungnad, *loc. cit.* 32, and Jensen, *loc. cit.* 177.

[11] In the case of this episode, too, the deeper mythological significance which no doubt underlay its superficial fantasy, remains obscure.

[12] So perhaps more originally; the immortality of his wife (and, according to Berossus, also of his daughter and of the steersman of his boat) may be a later introduction; cf. *PBS* IV 1, pp. 60-1.

[13] For the possible Alcinous-Utanapištim parallel, cf. Ungnad, *loc. cit.* 31, and Jensen, *loc. cit.* 179.

So much for the contents of the Babylonian Epic of Gilgameš.[13] As for the date of its composition, it is obvious from a comparison of the text of the Old Babylonian version with that of the much later Assyrian, that the poem was current in substantially the form in which we know it, as early as the first half of the second millennium B. C.[14] And so we come to the problem of origins. For in spite of the high antiquity of the Babylonian poem, even a superficial examination, restricted mainly to the onomastic material, reveals that much of its contents must go back to Sumerian rather than Semitic sources. The names of the two major protagonists, Gilgameš and Enkidu, are in all likelihood of Sumerian origin.[15] The parents of Gilgameš bear the good Sumerian names Lugalbanda and Ninsun. The goddess Aruru who fashioned Enkidu is the all-important Sumerian mother-goddess more commonly known under the names Ninmaḫ, Ninḫursag, and Nintu.[16] It is the Sumerian heaven-god An (i. e. the Babylonian Anu) who fashions the 'bull of heaven' for the vengeful Ištar. It is the Sumerian god Enlil who decrees Enkidu's death. In the deluge episode it is the Sumerian gods who play the predominant roles.

But fortunately there is no need to rely on logical deduction alone for the conclusion that much of the Epic of Gilgameš is of Sumerian origin; we actually have the Sumerian forerunners of several of the episodes narrated in the poem. As early as 1911, Radau published two Gilgameš texts from the Nippur collection of the University Museum, both of which are now known to belong to the Sumerian version of the so-called 'twelfth' tablet of the Epic of Gilgameš.[17] In 1913, Zimmern published a Berlin tablet of unknown provenance, inscribed with the Sumerian version of the 'bull of heaven' episode.[18] In 1914, Poebel published

[13] The preceding sketch outlines only the contents of the first eleven tablets of the epic, which constitute a reasonably integrated unit. For the contents of the 'twelfth' tablet and the problem of its relationship to the first eleven tablets, cf. pp. 18-23.

[14] The differences in style and detail between the text of the Assyrian version and the corresponding text of the Old Babylonian version, are not insignificant, but in view of the lapse of time involved, perhaps an entire millennium, the divergences are not unexpected.

[15] The exact etymology of the two names is still uncertain. For the name Gilgameš, the most likely etymology is gi(b)ilg(a)-mes 'the father, the hero' (the parenthesis enclosing the final a indicate the possibility that more originally the root of the word for 'father' may have been gi(b)ilg, rather than gi(b)ilga; for the amissibility of the b. cf. GSG § 44). In the word gi(b)ilg(a) 'father' (for the writing of gi(b)il in the name Gilgameš, cf. now Jacobsen, *AS* 11. 89, note 128, but note that in *all* the available Nippur material, the second sign is BÍL, not BIL [the sign BIL in *PBS* X 2 No. 5, is a miscopy for BÍL]; note, too, that the significant Hurrian variant BÍL [i. e. gi(b)il] without any preceding GIŠ [cf. Friedrich, *ZA* 39. 33] seems to be omitted in the note) the first part gi(b)il is written traditionally with the signs GIŠ.BÍL (cf. however the important variant BÍL [i. e. gi(b)il] without a preceding GIŠ noted already by Thureau-Dangin in *SAK* 22, note f). This combination GIŠ.BÍL may be explained either as a phonetic writing gi-bíl, or, and this seems more likely, the sign GIŠ may represent a frozen gloss of obscure origin, in which case, the combination GIŠ.BÍL is to be read ^{giš}gi(b)il; cf. already *GSG* § 44, and the two writings BÍL (i. e. gi(b)il without any preceding GIŠ, mentioned above. In any case, the assumption that the sign GIŠ in the writing GIŠ.BÍL for the syllable(s) gi(b)il of the word gi(b)ilg(a), stands for giš 'tree,' (cf. now *AS* 11. 189, note 48) is more than unlikely. (I stress this point in an effort to reduce to a minimum in the future such glib and loose etymologizing of the name as that of Mowinckel in *Acta Orientalia* 15. 141 ff.; the conclusions in regard to the nature of Gilgameš as deity which that noted scholar draws from the supposed and fanciful meanings of the name, are utterly fantastic and dangerously misleading).

As for the name Enkidu, there seems to be little reason to doubt that its first two syllables en and ki actually represent the words 'lord' and 'earth'; the meaning of the last syllable du, however, and consequently the meaning of the name as a whole, is still uncertain. It is to be stressed, moreover, that in spite of the writing with the sign DÙG in the Sumerian and Old Babylonian texts, the third syllable of the name ended with a vowel, not a consonant (cf. the variant writings in the other versions as listed by Thompson, *EG*, p. 50, and Friedrich, *ZA* 39. 41, and the fact that when used as subject of a transitive verb in the Sumerian texts, it is written en-ki-du$_{10}$-e, not en-ki-dùg-gi). The use of the sign DÙG for the last syllable is purely an orthographic phenomenon; the sign DÙG is not to be taken as the Sumerian word dùg 'good' in order to obtain what, superficially considered, seems to be a suitable etymology for the name (cf. now *EG* 10).

[16] If the name Aruru should prove to be the Semitic name of the goddess, its use in the epic as a substitute for one of the Sumerian names of the goddess, would not be surprising. As is apparent from the use of the names Šamaš (Sumerian Utu), Ištar (Sumerian Inanna), Ea (Sumerian Enki), the Babylonian redactors of the epic preferred to use the Semitic names in the case of those relatively few deities who had both Semitic and Sumerian names.

[17] *HAV* 11, 12; cf. Kramer in *AS* 10. 1 ff., and *JAOS* 60. 246, note 40; Jacobsen in *AS* 11. 89, note 128.

[18] *VS* X 196; Witzel was the first to identify it as the Sumerian version of the 'bull of heaven' episode and to

the famous 'deluge' tablet from the Nippur collection of the University Museum, inscribed with the Sumerian version of the flood episode as narrated by Utanapištim to Gilgameš in the eleventh tablet of the epic.[19] In the same volume, Poebel also published a small fragment belonging to the 'bull of heaven' episode.[20] In the very same year, Langdon published three tablets from the Nippur collection of the Istanbul Museum of the Ancient Orient, two of which belong to the Sumerian version of the 'twelfth' tablet of the epic,[21] while the third forms part of the Sumerian version of the Ḫuwawa episode.[22] In 1917, Langdon published a tablet from the Nippur collection of the University Museum, inscribed with a tale involving Gilgameš and Agga, the king of Kiš.[23] In 1924, Chiera published two Gilgameš fragments from the Nippur collection of the Museum of the Ancient Orient; the larger is part of the Sumerian version of the 'twelfth' tablet of the epic;[24] the smaller is part of the Gilgameš and Agga tale.[25] In the same year, De Genouillac published a very small fragment of a Kiš tablet belonging to the Sumerian version of the Ḫuwawa episode.[26] In 1932, Langdon published a tablet from Kiš which he identified as part of the Sumerian version of the Ḫuwawa episode.[27] In the following year, Gadd published a tablet from Ur which he recognized as belonging to the Sumerian version of the 'twelfth' tablet of the Epic of Gilgameš.[28] In 1934, Chiera published twelve Gilgameš fragments from the Nippur collection of the University Museum. Of these, two belong to the Sumerian version of the 'twelfth' tablet;[29] five belong to the Ḫuwawa episode;[30] one belongs to the 'bull of heaven' episode;[31] three belong to a poem dealing with the death of Gilgameš;[32] one belongs to the Gilgameš and Agga tale.[33] In 1935, Fish published a fragment of unknown provenance, belonging to the Gilgameš and Agga tale.[34] So much for the published texts.

Of the Sumerian material still unpublished, three Gilgameš fragments from the Nippur collection of the Museum of the Ancient Orient have been copied by me in Istanbul and will appear as Nos. 3-5 of my forthcoming *Sumerian Literary Texts From Nippur*. The first is part of the Gilgameš and Agga tale; the second is part of the Ḫuwawa episode; the third is part of the Sumerian version of the 'twelfth' tablet.[35] In addition I have copied from the Nippur collection of the University Museum seven pieces belonging to the Ḫuwawa episode;[36] eight pieces belonging to the Sumerian version of the 'twelfth' tablet;[37] one small fragment belonging to the 'bull of heaven' episode;[38] one piece belonging to the Gilgameš and Agga tale;[39] also a tablet which is inscribed with what is perhaps the very end of the Sumerian poem dealing with the death of Gilgameš.[40] Finally, in the Yale Babylonian Collection, there is an excellently preserved one-column tablet inscribed with the first 36 lines of the Ḫuwawa episode; its provenance is unknown, but it may well have been excavated in Nippur.[41]

---

recognize that *PBS* V 27 is a duplicate (cf. *OLZ* 34. 402-10.

[19] *PBS* V 1; cf. Poebel's transliteration, translation, and detailed commentary in *PBS* IV 1-70.

[20] *PBS* V 27; cf. note 18.

[21] *BE* XXXI 35, 55; cf. note 17.

[22] *BE* XXXI 31; cf. *JAOS* 60. 245, note 36.

[23] *PBS* X 2 No. 5; cf. *SEM* p. 2.

[24] *SRT* 39; cf. *ibid.* p. 35, and note 15.

[25] *SRT* 38; cf. *ibid.* p. 35, and note 23.

[26] *PRAK* I 174; cf. note 22.

[27] Ki 155 in *JRAS* 62. 914 ff.; cf. note 22.

[28] U 9364 in *RA* 30. 127 ff.; cf. note 17.

[29] *SEM* 21, 22; cf. note 17.

[30] *SEM* 27, 30, 31, and *STVC* 88; cf. note 22 and note that in the *JAOS* reference there given, *SEM* 30 has been omitted.

[31] *SEM* 26; cf. note 18.

[32] *SEM* 24, 25, 28.

[33] *SEM* 29; cf. note 23.

[34] *Bulletin of the Johns Rylands Library* 19. 362 ff.; cf. note 23.

[35] Cf. notes 23, 22, and 17 respectively.

[36] These are CBS 7914, and UM 29-13-209, 29-13-473, 29-13-633, 29-15-364, 29-16-84, 29-16-414; cf. note 22, and note that in the *JAOS* reference there given I mention only four pieces; the remaining three were identified later. (N. B. The University Museum numbers listed by me in the pattern CBS x.y.x. in preceding publications will from now on be listed as UM [instead of CBS] x-y-z [i. e. with hyphens instead of dots between the numbers]; on the other hand, those listed in all preceding publications as CBS x [x = a number], will continue to be listed in the same manner).

[37] These are CBS 10400, 15150, 19950, and UM 29-13-438, 29-13-536, 29-15-993, 29-16-58, 29-16-463; cf. note 17, and note that in the *JAOS* reference there given I mentioned only five; the remaining three were identified later.

[38] CBS 10391; cf. note 18.

[39] CBS 10355; cf. note 23.

[40] UM 29-16-86.

[41] YBC 9857. With the kind permission of Professors Stephens and Goetze, I prepared a transliteration of the text. Stephens plans to copy the tablet for a forthcoming volume containing the Sumerian literary tablets in the Yale Babylonian Collection (close to one hundred tablets

All in all, therefore, we now have a relatively large group of Sumerian Gilgameš texts, and a comparative analysis of their contents with those of the Epic of Gilgameš will reveal in what manner and to what extent the creators of the Babylonian epic utilized their Sumerian sources. However, the problem of the Sumerian origin of the Epic of Gilgameš is not as simple as it may seem at first glance, and unless the underlying complexities are clearly grasped, they may lead to an ambiguous approach and a beclouded solution. Before proceeding with our comparative study, therefore, it will be advisable to restate our problem in the following more detailed and more precise form:

(a) Is there a Sumerian original for the Epic of Gilgameš as a whole? That is, are we to expect to find a Sumerian poem which, in spite of the expected difference in form and content, so closely resembles the Babylonian epic that it can be readily recognized and accepted as its Sumerian precursor?[42]

(b) If it becomes clear from the material on hand that there is no Sumerian original for the Babylonian epic as a whole, and that only some of its episodes go back to Sumerian prototypes, are we in a position to identify these episodes with reasonable certainty?

(c) In the case of those episodes for which no Sumerian version is as yet available, are we justified in assuming a Semitic origin, or is there reason to believe that these, too, go back to Sumerian sources?

With the problem thus clearly formulated, we can now proceed with our comparative analysis of the contents of the available Sumerian Gilgameš material. It consists of six poems which we may designate as follows: (1) Gilgameš and Ḫuwawa, (2) Gilgameš and the 'Bull of Heaven,' (3) The Deluge,[43] (4) The Death of Gilgameš,[44] (5) Gilgameš and Agga of Kiš, (6) Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World. Let us realize from the start that the text of most of these poems is still fragmentary, and that even in those cases where it is complete, the translation is frequently difficult and uncertain. Nevertheless we will find that our available Sumerian material furnishes us with sufficient data to answer with certainty parts (a) and (b) of our problem. And while, obviously enough, the answer to (c) cannot be equally clear and assured, even in this case, it permits us a number of reasonably safe conclusions.[45]

First, then, the contents of the poem Gilgameš and Ḫuwawa.[46] Gilgameš has set his heart to go to the cedar mountain,[47] 'the mountain of the man of life;'[48] in order to obtain immortality. He

and fragments, many of which are in excellent condition), and will generously place his copy at my disposal for my forthcoming study 'Sumerian Tales of Gilgameš.'

[42] Cf., for example, the myth Ištar's Descent to the Nether World with its Sumerian counterpart Inanna's Descent to the Nether World. While the two versions differ so greatly that they have little more than the skeleton of the plot in common (cf. Kramer in *RA* 34. 96-7), their relationship is obvious and certain.

[43] This poem has nothing to do with Gilgameš; for its inclusion in our Sumerian Gilgameš material, see p. 12 f.

[44] For the possibility that this text may be the continuation of the tale Gilgameš and Ḫuwawa, cf. note 62.

[45] The scientific edition of five of these six poems (The Deluge will be omitted; cf. note 57), consisting of a transliteration and translation of their available text, and including copies of all the unpublished pieces in the University Museum is now being prepared under the title 'Sumerian Tales of Gilgameš.'

[46] For the available texts cf. notes 22, 26, 27, 30, 35, 36, 41; altogether these texts furnish us with approximately the first 180 lines of the poem. For a very brief summary of their contents, cf. *SL* (Kramer, 'Sumerian Literature' in *PAPS* 85. 293-323) 321 No. 5.

[47] Written kur-gišerin-TAR all through the poem; the reading and meaning of TAR in this case are uncertain.

[48] Written kur-lú-ti-la; it is not impossible that that lú-ti-la is a descriptive epithet of Ziusudra. If so, this kur-lú-ti-la, which is also described in our poem as the cedar mountain (note however, that the complex reads kur-gišerin-TAR rather than the expected kur-gišerin-na), is the place where Ziusudra dwelt after the gods had granted him eternal life. And since according to *PBS* V 1 vi 12, the dwelling place of the immortalized Ziusudra is (in all probability) Dilmun, 'the place where the sun rises,' it would follow that the cedar mountain of our poem is identical with Dilmun. Moreover, we have reasonably conclusive evidence from another source that Dilmun was noted for its cedars. A significant, but hitherto unutilized passage in a text published some twenty years ago (*SRT* iii 20-1 = *ibid.* 7, 31-2) reads as follows (the speaker is the goddess Ninisinna):

é-mu kur-dilmunki-nu-me-a gišerin(!)-ta ba-an-tu
ì-si-inki kur-dilmunki-nu-me-a giserin(!)-ta ba-an-tu

My house, before Dilmun existed, was fashioned from cedar,
Isin, before Dilmun existed, was fashioned from cedar.

Obviously, then, Dilmun must have been noted particularly for its cedar trees, and the identification of Dilmun with the cedar forest is not as unlikely as it may seem at first glance.

Moreover, if the identification of Dilmun with the cedar

tells his servant Enkidu[49] of his plan, and the latter advises him to first inform the sun-god Utu whom he describes as 'the builder of the mountain.'[50] Gilgameš thereupon brings offerings to Utu, informs him of his determination to enter the cedar forest, and pleads for his help and support. Utu responds favorably, and appoints 'the seven heroes, the sons of one mother'[51] to guide Gilgameš over the mountains to his desired destination. Overjoyed, Gilgameš calls for fifty volunteers from Erech, unattached men who have neither 'house' nor mother, to accompany him on his undertaking. Fully armed with weapons of bronze and wood, the expedition consisting of Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the fifty Erechites, crossed the seven mountains that lay between Erech and the cedar mountain. After crossing the last of these mountains, Gilgameš falls into a heavy sleep from which he is awakened only after considerable time and effort. Fully aroused by this unexpected delay he swears by his mother Ninsun and his father Lugalbanda that he will continue his journey and enter the cedar forest no matter who guards it, man or god. Enkidu now warns him of the ferocity of Ḫuwawa, the mountain's guardian, and tries to dissuade him from continuing with his perilous undertaking, but to no avail. The company approaches the cedar house of Ḫuwawa who stares at them with his 'eye of death.' The passage that follows is broken and obscure, and it is impossible to make out just what goes on between Ḫuwawa and Gilgameš; there is some possibility that this passage describes the cutting down of the cedar trees. When the text becomes intelligible once again, we find that Gilgameš has given Ḫuwawa quite a beating, and the latter is crying for mercy. Gilgameš takes pity on him and is ready to set him free, but Enkidu dissuades him from this generous deed. Our heroes then seem to bring Ḫuwawa before Enlil and Ninlil for judgment. At this point our available material comes to an end. But we may assume with reasonable probability that Ḫuwawa was finally put to death, and that Gilgameš did not obtain the sought-for immortality.[52]

If now we compare this Sumerian version of the Ḫuwawa episode with its Babylonian counterpart as narrated in the Epic of Gilgameš, we note that they have only the bare skeleton of the story in common: Gilgameš decides to journey to the cedar forest; he is accompanied by Enkidu; he seeks and obtains the protection of the sun-god;[53] they arrive at their destination; the cedar is felled; Ḫuwawa is killed. But in detail, arrangement, and emphasis, the two versions vary so greatly that it is difficult at times to recognize their basic relationship. Thus to mention but three of the more outstanding differences:

(1) In the Sumerian poem, the cedar mountain is described as the dwelling place of 'the man of life,' who is possibly to be identified with Ziusudra,

---

forest of our poem should prove correct, it would help to solve another long-standing difficulty. The Lugalannimundu inscription (cf. Güterbock, *ZA* 42. 40 ff.) mentions repeatedly the lands over which that monarch reigned, and each time it lists them in the following order: kur-gišerin-na, Elam, Marḫaši, Gutium, Šubur, Martu, Sutium, Eanna. That this order geographically motivated seems reasonably obvious; the only difficulty was, that the country designated as kur-gišerin-na would thus be located east of Babylonia, and this was contrary to the general assumption that wherever cedar mountains are mentioned in cuneiform literature, they are to be sought west of Babylonia (cf. e. g. Ungnad, *Subartu* 37, note 1). If, however, we identify Lugalannimundu's kur-gišerin-na with Dilmun, 'the place where the sun rises,' which was probably situated somewhere east of the Persian Gulf, the order in his inscription would conform with the expected geographic details. For additional proof that the Babylonians knew of a cedar mountain east of their country, cf. the kurgišerinki mentioned in *2R* 50. 65 which is listed between Gutium and Marḫaši (cf. already Jensen, in *KB* VI 437, and Poebel, *PBS* IV 1. 224, notes 2 and 4).

[49] In the Sumerian Gilgameš tales, Enkidu is invariably described as the servant, rather than the friend of Gilgameš; note, too, that the god-determinative never appears before his name.

[50] The Sumerian reads: kur-gišerin-TAR dim-ma-bi šul-dutu-kam, 'the . . . cedar mountain, its builder is the hero Utu.'

[51] The Sumerian reads: ur-sag-dumu-ama-aš--imin-me-eš.

[52] Cf. p. 13 for the poem describing the death of Gilgameš.

[53] Note here the interesting variation within the Babylonian epic itself. In the Old Babylonian version, it is Gilgameš, himself, who prays to the sun-god, while in the later Assyrian version, it is his mother Ninsun who intercedes for him before Šamaš. Our Sumerian poem agrees in this respect, therefore, with the Old Babylonian version; however, it expands considerably the description of the sun-god's protective acts. Not uninteresting, too, is the fact that our Sumerian poem describes the sun-god continually as dutu-an-na 'Utu of heaven,' a complex which has no corresponding phrase in any of the extant Semitic versions of the epic, but which has its exact counterpart in the dUTU ŠA.ME.E of the Hittite version; cf. Friedrich, *ZA* 39. 10 ff.

and Gilgameš's primary purpose in undertaking his dangerous journey is to obtain immortality. In the Babylonian version of the episode, the mountain of the cedar forest is *not* identical with that on which Utanapištim has his dwelling place, and Gilgameš undertakes his journey to raise up an enduring name for himself, not to obtain immortality. In the Babylonian epic, the quest for eternal life is reserved for its final, culminating episode, and is motivated in large part by the death of his friend Enkidu, an incident which, as we shall see below, represents a Semitic innovation.

(2) In the Sumerian poem, Gilgameš is accompanied not only by Enkidu but also by a party of fifty Erechites. In the Babylonian version, he is accompanied by Enkidu alone.

(3) In the Sumerian poem no reference is made to the council of elders of the city of Erech, which plays so prominent a role in the Semitic version.

Turning now to the Sumerian poem Gilgameš and the 'Bull of Heaven,' the contents, poorly preserved as they are, may be sketched as follows:[54] Following a lacuna of some twenty lines, the poem continues with an address by Inanna to Gilgameš in which the goddess describes the gifts and favors which she is prepared to shower upon him. It is not unreasonable to assume, therefore, that the preceding missing portion of the text contained Inanna's love proposals. Another break in the text follows, which must have contained Gilgameš's rejection of Inanna's offers. For when the text becomes intelligible once again, we find Inanna before An, the heaven-god, requesting to be presented with the 'bull of heaven.' An at first refuses, but Inanna threatens to take the matter up with all the great gods of the universe. Terrified, An grants her request. Inanna then sends the 'bull of heaven' down against Erech where it proceeds to ravage the city. From here on, the available text which concludes with an address by Enkidu to Gilgameš, becomes unintelligible. The end of the poem, which described no doubt Gilgameš's victorious struggle with the 'bull of heaven,' is missing altogether.

If we compare the contents of this Sumerian poem with the Babylonian version as it appears in the Epic of Gilgameš, we find a close and unmistakable resemblance in the broad outlines of the plot: Inanna-Ištar offers her love and tempting gifts to Gilgameš; the offer is rejected; with the unwilling consent of An-Anu, the 'bull of heaven' is sent to attack Erech; the creature ravages the city, but is finally killed. As for the details, once again we find that the two versions vary almost beyond the point of recognition. The gifts offered by Inanna-Ištar to tempt Gilgameš are quite different in the two versions. Gilgameš's rejection speech, which, in the Babylonian epic, consists of 56 lines, and is filled with learned allusions to Babylonian mythological and proverb literature, was certainly much briefer in the Sumerian version.[55] The contents of the conversations between Inanna-Ištar and An-Anu bear little similarity in the two versions.[56] Nor is there any reason to doubt that the concluding details of our Sumerian poem, when these are recovered, will have but little in common with those of the Babylonian epic.

We turn now to the flood episode which constitutes the major part of the eleventh tablet of the Epic of Gilgameš.[57] Significantly enough, the Sumerian counterpart of this episode has nothing whatever to do with Gilgameš. It is part of a poem devoted primarily to the myth of the immortalization of Ziusudra, which was artfully utilized by the Babylonian poets for their own plot-treatment. The poem begins with what seems to be a sketch of creation, and continues with a description of the establishment of the five prediluvian cities. Then follows the story of the deluge. The gods decide to destroy mankind by means of a flood. But Ziusudra, a pious, god-fearing king, is forewarned of the gods' decision by Enki, who advises him to construct a huge boat. This he does, and thus finds safety and shelter from the destructive deluge which lasted seven days and seven nights. On the eighth day, Utu, the sun-god, appears, and Ziusudra prostrates himself and brings sacrifices

[54] For the available texts, cf. notes 18, 20, 31, and 38; all in all less than one hundred lines, many only partially preserved, can as yet be restored.

[55] Note that in all probability the same is true of the Semitic version found in Boghaz Keui (see now *EG* 43).

[56] Cf. especially Inanna-Ištar's threatened action in case her request for the 'bull of heaven' is not granted. According to the Sumerian version she seems to threaten An-Anu with an assembly of the gods, while according to the Babylonian epic, she uses her dreaded threat of bringing up the dead from the nether world.

[57] Cf. note 19. The Nippur fragment, consisting of approximately the lower third of a six-column tablet, is still the only piece available for the restoration of this most significant myth; the treatment of the text by Poebel in *PBS* IV 1, remains standard.

to him. Finally An and Enlil grant him eternal life and place him (in all probability) in Dilmun, 'the land where the sun rises.'[58]

So much for the contents of our Sumerian deluge poem. Note now how the Babylonian creators of the Epic of Gilgameš moulded this material to fit the desired pattern. The weary Gilgameš, in accordance with the plot-development of their epic, comes before Utanapištim (the Babylonian Ziusudra), and questions him eagerly concerning the secret of eternal life. Instead of having him answer briefly and to the point, the Babylonian poets took advantage of this opening to insert their version of the deluge myth. The first, the creation part, of the Sumerian myth, they omitted altogether as unessential to their theme. They retained only the deluge episode ending with Ziusudra's immortalization. And by changing where necessary the third person to the first, they made Ziusudra-Utanapištim its narrator, instead of leaving it in its Sumerian form as a myth narrated by a nameless poet. In addition we find of course the not unexpected variations in details. Thus the description of Ziusudra-Utanapištim as a pious, humble, god-fearing king is omitted from the Babylonian version. On the other hand, the latter is much more lavish with details concerning the building of the boat, and the nature and violence of the flood. According to the Sumerian myth, the flood lasts seven days and seven nights, while according to its Babylonian counterpart, it lasts six days and seven nights. The sending of the birds to test the degree of water abatement is found only in the Babylonian epic.[59] Finally, it may be that the dwelling place of the immortalized Ziusudra-Utanapištim was not identical in the two versions.[60]

We now turn to the poem designated very tentatively as The Death of Gilgameš.[61] From the meager extant portion of the poem, only the following contents are recognizable. Gilgameš is still on his quest for immortality.[62] He is informed, however, (the identity of the speaker is uncertain)

---

[58] Cf. note 48.

[59] Cf. *PBS* IV 1. 57.

[60] The dwelling place of the immortalized Utanapištim is not named in the Babylonian epic, but is described as *ina rûqi ina pî nârâti* (cf. Poebel, *PBS* IV 1. 63 for an interesting suggestion), and we have at present no way of knowing whether these phrases were intended to describe Dilmun or some altogether different land.

At this point it is advisable to mention a possibility of explaining the great variations in detail between the episodes in the Babylonian epic and their Sumerian counterparts, which may already have suggested itself to the reader. Why not assume that our Babylonian versions of the various episodes go back to Sumerian prototypes as yet unrecovered, whose text varies considerably from that of the Sumerian poems available to us at present? In other words, perhaps it was not the Babylonian poets who introduced new features variant details; these differences already existed within the Sumerian material, itself. What points strongly, though perhaps not conclusively, against such an assumption, is the fact that at least by the time of the Isin-Larsa period, the text of the Sumerian compositions had already become uniform and standard. This is shown by the large number of duplicates now available for quite a number of Sumerian compositions; in practically all cases their texts agree except for very minor deviations. (For a clear and concrete example, cf. the very detailed list of variants in the introduction to the Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur, [*AS* XII], whose text is reconstructed from twenty-two tablets and fragments most of which are duplicates [as distinct from fragments belonging to the same tablet]). Nor is this true only of the Nippur duplicates; those from as far north as Kiš and from as far south as Ur, show the same text uniformity during the Isin-Larsa period. In case of our Sumerian compositions, therefore, any text differing very markedly from that of the available tablets and fragments, if it ever did exist, could be postulated only for the periods preceding that of Isin-Larsa. And so the suggestion that the Babylonian poets utilized Sumerian texts different from those known to us at present, would necessitate the further assumption that they created the epic no later than the Ur III period, and that, moreover, they consistently made use only of those versions which failed to become the standard text in the Isin-Larsa period. All of which is not impossible, but rather unlikely.

[61] For the text, cf. notes 32, 40; note carefully that *SEM* 24 and 25 join (24 rev. 1 = 25 i 11). All in all there is now available about one hundred lines from the middle of the poem (*SEM* 24 is a fragment of the extreme right of a tablet which probably had three columns to a side); about half of these are complete. If UM 29-16-86 also belongs to this poem (cf. note 62), it would furnish us with the last 42 lines.

[62] There is some possibility, therefore, that The Death of Gilgameš may be a continuation of the poem Gilgameš and Ḫuwawa, and that these two texts actually belong to the first and last parts of the same composition. As for UM 29-16-86, the legible portions seem to state that Gilgameš brought gifts to numerous deities and priests, among which are Ereškigal, Namtar (these two are listed first), Ningišzida, Dumuzi, 'the mothers and fathers' of Enlil, Šulpae, Ninḫursag, the Anunnaki, the Igigi. If this tablet contains the end of the poem The Death of Gilgameš (it closes with the line dgi[lg]ameš-en-kul-aba^{ki}-[ke$_4$]zà-sal-zu dùg-ga-àm, and must, therefore, be the end of whatever composition it belongs to), we must perhaps assume that these are gifts brought with him to the nether world.

that eternal life is impossible to obtain; kingship, prominence, heroism in battle—all these have been decreed for him, but not immortality. Follows the death of Gilgameš,[63] and a description of the ensuing mourning.[64] Meager as it is, the available text of our poem shows an indubitable source relationship to the portions of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh tablets of the Epic of Gilgameš which contain Gilgameš's plea for eternal life, and the rejoinder that it is death, not immortality, which is man's fate. As for the death of Gilgameš, strangely enough nothing is mentioned of it in the extant versions of the epic.

We conclude the sketch of our Sumerian Gilgameš material[65] with the poem Gilgameš and Agga of Kiš, a Sumerian tale of no little historical and political interest,[66] which has no counterpart at all in the Babylonian epic. In brief, its contents run as follows:[67] Agga, the king of Kiš, who according to our poem had at one time been a satellite of Gilgameš,[68] has now become powerful enough to demand that Erech become subservient to Kiš. He therefore sends messengers to Gilgameš to that effect. The latter gathers a council of the elders of Erech who, at the urging of Gilgameš, commit themselves to take up arms rather than submit to 'the house of Kiš.' Not yet satisfied, Gilgameš convokes a second council, this time of all the fighting men of Erech, and repeats his entreaties not to submit to 'the house of Kiš.' This council, too, solemnly resolves to fight rather than yield; moreover it pronounces Gilgameš as the king and hero of their city.[69] In spite of their brave words and heroic resolutions, however, the people of Erech are terrified by the thought of Agga's approach.[70] Only Gilgameš, though sadly troubled by the rather cowardly reaction of the Erechites, remains confident; he ends up an address to Enkidu with the lines:

> When he (Agga) shall have come, my great fear will overwhelm him,
> His judgment will be confounded, his counsel will be dissipated.[71]

In a very short time,[72] however, Agga seems to have succeeded in seizing the outskirts of the city, and the Erechites were dumbfounded. Gilgameš then addresses the heroes of Erech, and asks for a volunteer to go before Agga. He finds one in Birḫurturri,[73] who seems convinced that he can confound the judgment and counsel of the king of Kiš.[74] No sooner does Birḫurturri pass through the gate, however, than he seems to be seized, beaten, and brought before Agga. He begins to address Agga, but before he has finished, another hero[75] ascends the walls of Erech, perhaps to observe what is going on.[76] Follows a conversation between Agga and Birḫurturri whose meaning it is as yet impossible to penetrate although the text is in perfect condition. It is reasonably clear, however, that Birḫurturri fails to come to terms with Agga, and once again he is beaten by Agga's men.[77] Gilgameš, himself, then ascends the walls of Erech. The Erechites, young and old, are now overcome with fright, while the fighting men clutch their weapons. Whereupon Enkidu goes out through the gate and seems to persuade Agga to withdraw his forces and leave Erech in peace.[78]

---

[63] The statement is probably repeated in a varied form at least a dozen times (cf. *SEM* 28 rev. 1-14).

[64] Cf. *SEM* 28 rev. 15 ff.

[65] For Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World, see p. 18 ff.

[66] Cf. *SEM* p. 2; also Jacobsen, *JNES* 2. 165 f.

[67] For the text, cf. notes 23, 25, 33, 34, 35, 39. The poem consists of 115 lines in almost perfect condition; nevertheless the text still presents so many difficulties to the translator that much of its meaning is still in doubt. For a very brief sketch of its contents, cf. *SL* 321 No. 4. Cf. also Jacobsen in *JNES* 2. 165 f.; the latter made excellent use of the material at his disposal, but as will be seen in the forthcoming 'Sumerian Tales of Gilgameš' his suggested restorations are incorrect.

[68] Cf. *SEM* 29. 41-2.

[69] Cf. *PBS* X 2 No. 5 obv. 3-20.

[70] Cf. *ibid.* obv. 21-4.

[71] Cf. *ibid.* obv. 25–rev. 7; the two quoted lines read:
e-ne du-a-ni-ta ní-gal-mu(!) ḫé-ib(!)-šú
dím-ma-ni ḫé-sùḫ galga-a-ni ḫé-bir-ri
Cf. already *AS* 12. 88.

[72] Expressed in Sumerian by the idiom u_4-nu-5-àm u_4-nu-10-àm, 'It was not five days, it was not ten days'; cf. *ibid.* rev. 8.

[73] Written bir-ḫur-tur-ri; cf. *SEM* 29. 2 (-tur- was omitted by Chiera), 18, 23. In *PBS* X 2 No. 5 rev. 14, 18, 19, 21, the second sign was written by the scribe as BIR (instead of ḪUR); his attempt to erase the inside of the sign is quite apparent on the original, although he did fail to substitute the correct wedges (Langdon's copy of the sign as BIR fails to take notice of this fact). In *PBS* X 2 No. 5 rev. 14 and *SLTN* 3, the name ends in -ra rather than -ri.

[74] Cf. *PBS* X 2 No. 5 rev. 8-18.

[75] His name is written zabar ...-ga; cf. *SEM* 29, 5, 24; Fish, rev. i 2.

[76] Cf. *SEM* 29. 1-7.

[77] Cf. *ibid.* 8-23.

[78] Cf. *ibid.* 24-39. (Fish, rev. i 2–end). Note that *SEM* 29. 34-39 are identical with *ibid.* 16-21, except that the verbal forms are positive in the former and negative in the latter.

Gilgameš then thanks Agga whom he describes as his 'overseer,' 'supervisor,' and 'captain of the host,'[79] for sparing his life; moreover, he pronounces Agga as the king and hero of Erech in the identical words which the Erechite council had used when honoring Gilgameš with the very same titles.[80]

We have now completed the comparative analysis of the contents of the relevant Sumerian Gilgameš material at our disposal, and are thus prepared to answer the problem as formulated on pp. 8-9:

(a) Is there a Sumerian original of the Babylonian Epic of Gilgameš as a whole? Obviously not. The Sumerian poems vary considerably in length, and consist of individual, disconnected tales. The plot sequence of the Babylonian epic by means of which the several episodes are so modified and connected as to form a reasonably integrated unit, is clearly a Babylonian innovation and achievement.[81]

(b) Are we in a position to identify those episodes in the Babylonian epic which go back to Sumerian prototypes? Yes. The Ḫuwawa episode (Tablets III-V of the epic), the 'bull of heaven' episode (Tablet VI), portions of the 'quest for immortality' episode (Tablets IX, X, XI),[82] the 'deluge' story (Chapter XI), all have their Sumerian counterparts. As repeatedly stressed, however, the Babylonian versions are no slavish reproductions of their Sumerian originals; it is only the broad outlines of the plot that they have in common.

(c) But what of those portions of the Epic of Gilgameš for which no Sumerian prototypes are as yet at our disposal: the introduction at the beginning of the epic; the series of incidents culminating in the forging of the bond of friendship between Gilgameš and Enkidu (Tablets I and II); the death and burial of Enkidu (Tablets VII, VIII?[83] Are these of Babylonian origin, or do they, too, go back to Sumerian sources? In the very nature of things, the answer to this problem must be highly hypothetical in character. Nevertheless an analysis of this Babylonian material in the light of the extant Sumerian epics and myths will permit a number of suggestive, if tentative, conclusions.

First, then, the introductory passage at the very beginning of the epic.[84] After describing the hero as an all-seeing, all-knowing wanderer who had built the walls of Erech, the poet continues with a rhapsodic description of these walls, largely in the form of a rhetorical address to the reader. In none of the Sumerian epic material known to date do we find a parallel stylistic feature. We may therefore safely conclude that the introduction to the epic is a Babylonian innovation.

The chain of events leading to the friendship between the two heroes, which follows the introduction and constitutes the major part of Tablets I and II of the epic, may be listed as follows: (1) The Tyranny of Gilgameš, (2) The Creation of Enkidu, (3) Enkidu and the Trapper, (4) The 'Fall' of Enkidu, (5) The Dreams of Gilgameš,[85] (6) The Civilizing of Enkidu, (7) The Struggle. These incidents form a well-knit plot-progression culminating in the friendship of the two heroes. This friendship motif is then utilized in all probability by the poet to help motivate the journey to the cedar forest. No such motivation is to be found in the Sumerian version of the journey to the

[79] Cf. *SEM* 29. 42-3:
ag-ga-a ugula-a-mu ag-ga-a nu-banda-mu
ag-ga šakanak-erín-na-a-mu

[80] *Ibid.* 40-53; cf. especially *ibid.* 47-50 with PBS X 2 No. 5 obv. 15-20.

[81] It is Langdon's misunderstanding of this very point, and his erroneous belief in the existence of a Sumerian Epic of Gilgameš corresponding by and large to the Babylonian epic, which is responsible for some of the unfortunate conclusions in his study 'The Sumerian Epic of Gilgamish' (*JRAS* 62. 911 ff.).

[82] It is to be carefully noted that, judging from the material available at present, the Sumerian version of Gilgameš's quest for immortality began with his journey to the land of the cedar forest, described as 'the land of the man of life,' which led to the Ḫuwawa episode; cf. p. 9 f. In the Epic of Gilgameš, however, the journey to the cedar forest with its Ḫuwawa episode is motivated by Gilgameš's thirst for adventure and fame; probably, too, by his desire to take the unhappy Enkidu away from Erech's sensual environment. The quest for eternal life does not begin in the Babylonian epic until after the death of Enkidu, an incident which is probably a Semitic innovation (cf. p. 17). As for Gilgameš's journey to, and through, Mt. Mâšu, which plays so important a part in the Babylonian version of Gilgameš's quest for immortality, it may have been incorporated in the epic from a Sumerian poem which had nothing to do with Gilgameš (cf. note 87) or we may still find its counterpart in the missing portions of the Sumerian tales (cf., however, note 62) Gilgameš and Ḫuwawa, and The Death of Gilgameš.

[83] For the Mt. Mâšu episode, cf. preceding note.

[84] Cf. note 3.

[85] So according to the arrangement in the Assyrian version.

cedar forest,[86] and we may safely assume that we will find no Sumerian counterpart of the chain of incidents as linked in the epic. It would not surprise us, however, to find Sumerian prototypes for several of the individual incidents comprising the plot-chain, although these prototypes need not always consist of Gilgameš tales.[87] Thus in case of The Tyranny of Gilgameš, with its *pukku* motif, we may find its Sumerian source in the poem Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World.[88] The mytho-epic motifs in The Creation of Enkidu (note the Sumerian god names Ninurta, Nidaba, and Sumugan), The Dreams of Gilgameš, and The Struggle, certainly reflect Sumerian sources. As for Enkidu and the Trapper, The 'Fall' of Enkidu, and The Civilizing of Enkidu, we still have no criteria for a reasonably safe conclusion, and we must leave undecided the very interesting question whether the concept that sex experience is responsible for man's wisdom, is of Semitic or Sumerian origin.

Finally the story of the death of Enkidu and his burial is in all likelihood of Babylonian rather than of Sumerian origin.[89] For according to the Sumerian poem Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World (see below for an analysis of its contents), Enkidu did not die at all in the ordinary sense of the word; he was seized and held fast by Kur,[90] after he had knowingly and consistently broken the tabus of the nether world whither he had descended to bring up Gilgameš's *pukku* and *mikkû*. The incident of the death of Enkidu was invented by the Babylonian authors of the Epic of Gilgameš in order to motivate dramatically Gilgameš's quest for immortality which climaxes the poem.[91]

And so, to sum up. Of the various individual episodes comprising the Epic of Gilgameš, several go back to Sumerian prototypes actually involving the hero Gilgameš. Moreover, even in case of those episodes which lack such Sumerian counterparts, most of the detached, individual motifs reflect Sumerian mythic and epic sources. In no case, however, do the Babylonian poets copy slavishly their Sumerian material; they so modify its content, and mold its form, in accordance with their own temper and heritage, that only the bare nucleus of the Sumerian original remains recognizable. As for the plot-structure of the epic as a whole, the forceful and fateful episodic drama of the restless, adventurous hero and his inevitable disillusionment, it is definitely a Babylonian, rather than Sumerian, development and achievement. In a very deep sense, therefore, the Epic of Gilgameš may be truly described as a Semitic creation.[92]

We conclude our study with an analysis of the contents of the Sumerian poem Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World, which clarify at long last the major difficulties in the so-called 'twelfth' tablet of the Babylonian epic.[93] The poem begins with what may be described as an introduction of twenty-seven lines whose contents have nothing to do with the story itself. The first thirteen lines of this passage contain some of our basic data for the analysis of the Sumerian concepts of the creation of the universe,[94] while the remaining fourteen lines describe the struggle between Enki and Kur.[95] The story of the poem, briefly sketched, runs as follows:

'In those days,' a *huluppu*-tree, planted on the bank of the Euphrates and nurtured by its waters, was attacked violently by the South Wind, and flooded by the waters of the Euphrates. Inanna, walking by, took the tree in her hand and brought it to her city Erech where she planted it in her holy garden. There she tended it most carefully. For when the tree grew big, she planned to make of its wood, a chair for herself and a couch.

Years pass; the tree matured and grew big. But Inanna found herself unable to cut down the tree. For at its base, the snake who 'knows no charm' had built its nest. In its crown, the Zu-bird had placed its young. In its middle, Lilith had built her house. And so Inanna, the light-hearted and ever joyful maid, sheds bitter tears.

---

[86] Cf. note 82.

[87] That is, as in the case of the flood episode, the Babylonian poets may have introduced motifs from Sumerian myths and epic tales totally unrelated to Gilgameš.

[88] Cf. p. 19 and note 100.

[89] In this case, too, it is to be stressed that at least some of the individual motifs in the episode, e. g. the dreams, some of the burial rites, probably reflect Sumerian sources.

[90] Cf. note 105.

[91] Note that according to the Sumerian prototype, the poem Gilgameš and Ḫuwawa, Enkidu, as well as fifty other Erechites, accompany Gilgameš on his journey in quest for immortality; cf. p. 9.

[92] Cf. already my comment in *JAOS* 63. 70, note 3.

[93] For the tablets and fragments utilized, cf. notes 17, 21, 28, 29, 35, 37.

[94] Cf. *SM* 37-9.

[95] Cf. *SM* 78-9.

As the dawn broke, and her brother, the sun-god Utu, came forth from his *ganunnu*,[96] she repeated to him tearfully all that had befallen her *ḫuluppu*-tree. Thereupon Gilgameš chivalrously came to her aid. He donned his armour weighing fifty minas, and with his 'ax of the road,' seven talents and seven minas in weight, he slew the snake who 'knows no charm' at the base of the tree. Seeing which, the Zu-bird fled with its young to the mountain, while Lilith tore down her house and fled to the desolate places. Gilgameš and the men of Erech who accompanied him now cut down the tree and gave it to Inanna for her chair and couch. Either Gilgameš, or Inanna,[97] then fashioned of the base of the tree a *pukku*, probably a 'drum,' and of its crown, a *mikkû*, probably a 'drumstick.'[98]

Follows a passage of twelve lines[99] which describes Gilgameš's activity in Erech with this *pukku* and *mikkû*, with this 'drum' and 'drumstick.' Despite the fact that the text is in perfect condition, it is still impossible to penetrate its meaning. It is not improbable, however, that it describes in some detail the overbearing and tyrannical acts which, according to the first tablet of the Epic of Gilgameš, brought woe to the inhabitants of Erech, and which, again according to the Babylonian epic only, led to the creation of Enkidu. When the story becomes intelligible once again, it continues with the statement that 'because of the outcry of the young maidens,'[100] the *pukku* and *mikkû* fell into the nether world. Gilgameš put in his hand as well as his foot to retrieve them, but was unable to reach them. And so he seats himself at the gate of the nether world and laments:

O my *pukku*, O my *mikkû*,
My *pukku* whose *lustiness* was irresistible,
My *mikkû* whose *pulsations could not be drowned out*,
In those days *when* verily my *pukku* was with me in the house of the carpenter,
(*When*) verily the wife of the carpenter was with me like the mother who gave birth to me,
(*When*) verily the daughter of the carpenter was with me *like* my younger sister,
My *pukku*, who will bring it up from the nether world,
My *mikkû*, who will bring it up from the 'face' of the nether world?[101]

His servant Enkidu,[102] his constant follower and companion, thereupon volunteers to descend to the nether world and bring them up for him, saying:

O my master, why dost thou cry, why is thy heart sick?
Thy *pukku*, lo, I will now bring it up from the nether world,
Thy *mikku*, I will bring it up from the 'face' of the nether world.[103]

[96] Cf. *SM*, note 45.

[97] Cf. U 9364, line 22. The pronoun e-ne at the beginning of the line is ambiguous since it may be translated either 'he' (Gilgameš) or 'she' (Inanna, as I assumed in *SM* 34).

[98] So Landsberger *apud* Ranozsek, *ZDMG* 88.210; it was Goetze who informed me of this reference.

[99] U 9364, lines 24-35.

[100] Cf. *ibid.* 36; the maidens probably cried out against Gilgameš's oppressive acts involving the use of the *pukku* and *mikkû*.

[101] Cf. *ibid.* 42-49; for the transliteration, cf. Gadd, *RA* 30.133, and note the following: The complex DI. (is it perhaps an error for KI?) E.NE.DI.DI may be related in meaning to KI.E.NE.DI and E.NE.DI with the reading ešemen, and the meanings *melultu* and *kippû*; cf. *AS* 12.87 f. The translation 'whose pulsations' assumes that DI.E.NE.DI.DI is parallel with la-la-bi of the preceding line, and that the possessive -bi has been erroneously omitted by the scribe (for similar slips on the part of the scribe of U 9364, cf. notes 103, 105). My rendering of ll. 45-7 is obviously far from satisfactory; it represents an attempt to give the reader an inkling of their contents; the mythological implications and significance of these lines escape us completely. For the u_4-ba of line 45, the corresponding Semitic line (*EG* pl. 54.308) has *ûma* for the expected *ina ûmišu*. In the relative verbal form nu-uš-ma-da-gál-la (ll. 45-7) the particle nu-uš corresponds to the Accadian *lû* (cf. *EG* pl. 54.308); the initial nu- of this particle is *not* the negative nu- (note the known equation nu-uš = lûman). The Semitic equivalent of nu-uš-ma-da-gál-la (*EG* pl. 54.308) is probably to be restored as *lû e-šú-u* 'verily I had,' rather than *lû e-zib*, as is usually assumed. In line 46, if the translation 'like the mother, my begetter' is correct for ama-ugu-mà-gim, the possessive pronoun should have read -mu, rather than -mà. In line 47, the translation assumes that the postposition -gim should have followed nín-bàn-da-mu, since the complex seems to parallel the ama-ugu-mà-gim of the preceding line; for the reading nín of the sign SAL.KU, cf. *AS* 12.96. The verbal forms in lines 48-9 are to be read im-ta-e_{11}-dè not im-ta-gù-de. In line 49, the signs IGI.KUR are perhaps to be read igi-kur, rather than ḫinar, cf. *SL* 298.117 and *RA* 34.127.

[102] Cf. note 49.

[103] Cf. U 9364, lines 50-2; for the transliteration, cf. Gadd, *RA* 30.132, and note the following: The signs -ERIN-ERIN (line 51) are to be read -$še_8$-$še_8$. The corresponding Semitic *ûma* for the u_4-da of line 52 (*EG* pl. 55.5) is written as U_4; in *EG* pl. 54.308, on the other hand, the *ûma* which corresponds rather unexpectedly to the Sumerian u_4-ba (cf. preceding note), is written as U_4-ma; if there is any significance to this orthographic variation, I am unable to penetrate it.

Hearing his servant's generous offer, Gilgameš warns him of a number of the nether world tabus which he is to guard against; the passage reads:

Gilgameš says to Enkidu:[104]
'If now thou wilt descend to the nether world,
A word I speak to thee, take my word,
Instruction I offer thee, take my instruction.
Do not put on clean clothes,
Lest like an enemy *they will mark thee*;
Do not anoint thyself with the good oil of the *bûru*-vessel,
Lest at its smell they will crowd about thee.
Do not throw the throw-stick in the nether world,
Lest they who were struck by the throw-stick will surround thee;
Do not carry a staff in thy hand,
Lest the shades will flutter all about thee.
Do not put sandals on thy feet,
In the nether world make no cry;
Kiss not thy beloved wife,
Strike not thy hated wife,
Kiss not thy beloved son,
Strike not thy hated son,
Lest the outcry of Kur will seize thee;
(*The outcry*) *to* her who is lying, to her who is lying,
To the mother of Ninazu who is lying,
Whose holy *body* no garment covers,
Whose holy breast no cloth wraps.[105]

But Enkidu heeds not the instructions of his master and commits all those very acts against which Gilgameš has warned him. And so he is seized by Kur and is unable to reascend to the earth. Thereupon Gilgameš proceeds to Nippur and weeps before Enlil:

O father Enlil, my *pukku* fell into the nether world,
My *mikkû* fell into the 'face' of the nether world;
I sent Enkidu to bring them up, Kur has seized him.
Namtar has not seized him, Asig has not seized him,
Kur has seized him.
Nergal's ambusher, who spares no one, has not seized him, Kur has seized him.

The verbal form in lines 52-3, reads ḫu-mu-ra-ab-e$_{11}$-dè, not ḫu-mu-ra-ab-gù-dè; moreover, as is proved by the duplicates CBS 10400, and 15150, ḫu-, the third person precative particle, is a scribal error for ga-, the first person precative particle.

[104] The Sumerian for this line reads: dgilgameš-e en-ki-du$_{10}$-ra gù mu-na-dé-e. This line is omitted in U 9364, but already in *AS* 10. 16, basing myself on the sense demanded by the context, I suggested its insertion between lines 53-4, in spite of its omission by the scribe of U 9364. The correctness of this suggestion, so critical to the understanding of the text of our Sumerian poem as well as of that of the Semitic 'twelfth' tablet (cf. p. 22), is now gratifyingly verified by the duplicates CBS 10400, 15150, and UM 29-13-438.

[105] For the Sumerian of all but the last two lines of Gilgameš's instructions to Enkidu, cf. U 9364, lines 54–end. The Sumerian of the last two lines in our passage is taken from UM 29-16-58, lines 15-16 which read: ḫur-kug-ga-na túg nu-um-dul gaba-kug-ga-na qada nu-um-búr. For the transliteration of U 9364, lines 54-6, cf. Kramer, *BASOR* 79. 25, note 25, where a meaning such as 'direction' is proved for the Sumerian nari(g) and its Semitic equivalent *aširtu*; our translation 'instruction' may perhaps come closer to the actual meaning ('advice' in *SM* 35 is to be modified accordingly).

For the transliteration of U 9364, lines 57–end, cf. Gadd, *RA* 30. 133, and Kramer, *AS* 10. 14; note now the following: The signs IGI.RA (U 9364, line 58) are, to judge from the duplicates CBS 19950, UM 29-16-58, a miscopy for IGI.DUB, i. e. the sign which has the readings izkim and agrig. The verb of this line is probably to be restored to read na-an-è-eš, since the duplicate UM 29-16-463 reads na-an-ni-a(!)-è-eš. The translation 'Lest like an enemy they will mark thee' (cf. *SM* 35 which is to be modified accordingly) is far from certain; the word 'mark' (note that its Semitic equivalent in *EG* pl. 55. 15 may perhaps be best restored as *ú-a-ad-du-ka*) attempts to translate the compound verb izkim–è; note, too, that the subject of this verb and that of line 60, which seems to be 'the denizens of the nether world,' is missing; cf. *AS* 10. 18. In line 65, the last two signs in the verb seem to read (with Gadd) -si-ga; the correct form -si-gi is now to be found in UM 29-16-463.

The translation 'outcry of Kur' (note my previous translations 'the wail of the nether world' in *AS* 10. 15, and 'the ['thy,' is a misprint] cry of the nether world' in *SM* 35) renders the Sumerian I.AN.U$_4$-kur-ra, and its Semitic equivalent *tazimti irṣitim*; cf. Gadd, *RA* 30. 134, 139. The same ideogram I.AN.U$_4$ is used in the phrase rendered on p. 19 as 'the outcry of the young maidens,' a plaint resulting no doubt, from the oppressive acts of Gilgameš. In case of 'the outcry of Kur,' it seems likely that Kur's complaint resulted from Enkidu's riding roughshod over the tabus of the nether world. Moreover if the translation 'to' for the -ra of the following two lines, is correct, Kur registers his complaint with the mother of Ninazu (Ninlil, according to *SM* 43 ff.) who was lying stark naked in the nether world. (Note, however, that in *SM* 35, I translated this -ra by 'for' under the [what seems to me now not so likely] assumption, that Kur's outcry which seized Enkidu was due, not to Enkidu's insolent behaviour, but to some distressing incident involving the mother of Ninazu). In 'the outcry of Kur,' it is to be noted, the Sumerian word kur has been rendered by Kur (i. e. an animate being) rather than 'nether world.' Note, too, that in Gilgameš's description before Enlil and Enki, of just what it was that happened to Enkidu (cf. note 106), he states that it was kur (seemingly for the fuller I.AN.U$_4$-kur-ra) who had seized him, and here the word kur is used in parallelism with the demons Namtar, Asig, and Nergal's ambusher; here, too, therefore, kur seems to stand for a living creature.

In battle, *the place of manliness*, he has not fallen,
Kur has seized him.[106]

But Enlil refuses to stand by Gilgameš, who then proceeds to Eridu and repeats his plea before Enki.[107] The latter orders Utu to open a hole in the nether world and to allow the shade of Enkidu to ascend to the earth.[108] Utu does as bidden, and the shade of Enkidu appears before Gilgameš. Master and servant embrace, and Gilgameš questions Enkidu about what he saw in the nether world.[109] The first seven questions concern the treatment in the nether world of those who were fathers of from one to seven sons respectively.[110] As is obvious from Enkidu's answers, the treatment improves as the number of sons increases, until the father of seven sons is likened to a companion of the gods. The remaining text of our poem is poorly preserved, but we still have parts of the Gilgameš-Enkidu colloquy concerning the treatment in the nether world of the palace servant, of the birth-giving woman, of him who falls in battle, of him whose shade has no one to care for it, and of him whose body lies unburied in the plain.[111]

So much for our Sumerian poem Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World. Let us now turn to the 'twelfth' tablet of the Epic of Gilgameš, whose close relationship to the Sumerian composition was first recognized by Gadd when he published the Ur tablet U 9364. The text of this 'twelfth' tablet has been known now for more than half a century, but much of its contents has remained unintelligible to this day in spite of the efforts of a long list of distinguished Assyriologists at their interpretation.[112] The difficulties involved and their solution may now be outlined as follows: The first 11 lines of the tablet (numbered in *EG* XII as lines 1-13) are almost entirely broken away in the text; these can now be practically completely restored from our Sumerian poem.[113]

[106] The corresponding Sumerian lines read as follows:

a-a-den-líl giš ellag-mu kur-šè mu-da-an-šub
giš E.KID-ma-mu igi-kur-šè mu-da-an-šub
en-ki-du$_{10}$ e$_{11}$-dè l-gi$_4$ kur-ri im-ma-an-díb
nam-tar nu-un-díb á-sìg nu-un-díb kur-ri im-ma-an-díb
nam-nitaḫ-a-ke$_4$ mè-a nu-šub kur-ri im-ma-an-díb
dudug-dnè-ri$_4$-gal sag-šu-du$_7$-du$_7$ nu-un-díb kur-ri im-ma-an-díb

Cf. *BE* XXXI 35 and *JAOS* 60. 247; the former begins with the last three lines of Gilgameš's address to Enlil, but practically the entire passage can be restored with the help of lines 5-10 which contains Gilgameš's identical plea before Enki, after Enlil's refusal to help him. In the first line of the passage, note the writing E.KID for the word rendered by *mikkû* (cf. also *BE* XXXI 55. 17 = U 9364, line 23) as a variant for E.AG; if AG has the reading kid here, the Sumerian word may perhaps be ekid(i)m. For the translation of kur in lines 3-5 of the passage by Kur, rather than 'nether world,' cf. note 105; note also the renderings 'Asig' (to conform more with the Sumerian word), and Nergal's ambusher (instead of Nergal, the ambusher); the translation in *SM* 35 is to be modified accordingly. For the corresponding Semitic passage, cf. *EG* pl. 56. 56-60; the sign *TAR* in the verb *im-TAR-an-ni-ma* (lines 56-7), as Gadd has pointed out (*RA* 30. 139 f.) is to be read *qut*, not *ḫaṣ*; in line 58, the verb to be restored is probably *ašpur*; lines 60-61 are inverted in the Sumerian equivalent as given in *BE* 35.

[107] Cf. *BE* XXXI 35. 4 and especially *JAOS* 60. 246.

[108] Cf. *BE* XXXI 35. 13 which is to be read: ur-sag-šul-dutu dumu-dnin-gal-e-tu-da gù[mu-na-d]é-e, 'He (Enki, cf. preceding line) says to the mighty hero Utu, the son born of Ningal.' Note that in the corresponding Semitic line (*EG* pl. 57. 77) the god addressed by Enki is assumed to be Nergal; his name is broken away in that line and line 78, but in line 82, where he is again mentioned, the traces, if correctly copied, do point to the restoration Nergal (written UGUR). As is now evident to the reader, however, the Semitic version follows the Sumerian so closely, that the restoration of the broken sign as U$_4$ (i. e. Utu) must be considered as a possibility.

[109] Cf. e. g. the last line of *BE* XXXI 35: lú-dumu-ni-àm igi bí-du$_8$-àm igi bí-du$_8$-àm a-na-gim an-ag 'Him who has six sons, hast thou seen?' 'I have seen.' 'How is he treated?' Enkidu's answer follows.

[110] Cf. *BE* XXXI 35, 27–end and *HAV* 11. 1-10.

[111] Cf. *HAV* 11. 11–end; note that Radau erroneously numbered the obverse and reverse consecutively; actually there is a break of about 20 lines between them.

[112] Cf. e. g. Jensen's efforts in *KB* VI 521 ff.; Gressmann, in Gressmann-Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesch Epos* 225 ff.; Thompson, *EG* 8; Schott, *ZA* 42. 142; and now Böhl, *Het Gilgamesj-Epos* 98-9, 162–end.

[113] The restoration runs approximately as follows:

1. *ûma pukku ina bît naggari lû êšû*
2. *aššat naggari kîma ummu alittiša lû êšû*
3. *mârat naggari kîma aḫâtiša ṣiḫirti lû êšû*
4. *ûma pukku ultu irṣitim mannu ušelli*
5. *mikkê ultu irṣitim mannu ušelli*
   [denkidu ana šašuma izakkara ana dgilgameš bêlišu]
6. *bêli mînâ tabakki mînâ ilmun libbuka*
7. *ûma pukku ultu irṣitim anâku ušelli*
8. *mikkê ultu irṣitim anâku ušelli*
9. *dgilgameš ana šašuma izakkara ana denkidu ardišu*
10. *šumma ana irṣitim turrad*
11. *ana aširtiša lû tašdud*

The corresponding Sumerian lines are U 9364, lines 45-56 (the last two lines of the Sumerian text correspond to our line 11, cf. note 115); for details cf. notes 101, 103, 104. That the first line of Tablet XII (cf. the colophon of Tablet XI, *EG* pl. 54. 308) corresponds to U 9364,

Lines 12-29 (*EG* XII 14-31) which contain the admonition against breaking the tabus of the nether world, were erroneously conceived by all the translators as addressed to Gilgameš (by some unknown deity or person); our Sumerian poem shows they contain the instructions of Gilgameš to Enkidu.[114] The subject of lines 30-48 (*EG* XII 32-49) which describes the insolent performance of all the tabued acts, was taken by all the scholars to be Gilgameš; the Sumerian poem shows that it was Enkidu.[115] The nature of Gilgameš's pleas to Enlil, Sin, and Ea for the return of Enkidu, as described in lines 54-59, 61-66, 68-73 (*EG* XII 56-61, 63-68, 70-75) could not possibly have been clearly understood without the new data furnished by the first part of our Sumerian poem, which the 'twelfth' tablet omits altogether.[116] Finally, the question-answer colloquy between Gilgameš and the shade of Enkidu, which is very fragmentary in the 'twelfth' tablet, can now be restored to a considerable extent by the last part of the Sumerian composition.

In conclusion, a comparison of the text of the 'twelfth' tablet of the Epic of Gilgameš with that of our Sumerian poem Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World, proves beyond all doubt what has long been suspected, that is, that the 'twelfth' tablet is an inorganic appendage attached to the Babylonian epic whose first eleven tablets constitute a reasonably well-integrated poetic unit. For the first line of the 'twelfth' tablet corresponds, not to the first line of our Sumerian poem, but to line 126, a line in the very middle of Gilgameš's wail over his lost *pukku* and *mikkû*.[117] In short, for some unknown reason, and with complete disregard for the sense and continuity of the Epic of Gilgameš, the Babylonian scribes attached an almost verbatim translation of the latter half of the Sumerian poem Gilgameš, Enkidu, and the Nether World, as a twelfth tablet, to the eleven tablets which actually constitute the Sumerian composition.[118]

---

is now quite certain; since we now have the complete text of the Sumerian poem preceding this line, Gadd's objections and suggestions (*RA* 30. 142) no longer hold. For the restoration of the verb in lines 1-3 as *êšû*, rather than *êzib*, cf. note 101; as is there pointed out the meaning for these three lines is very obscure; as for the restored forms *pukku* and *mikkê* (lines 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) note that the scribe of Tablet XII seems to use them without regard to case endings.

Note carefully that the first three lines of Tablet XII are completely destroyed from its extant text; it is with our line 4 (its Sumerian counterpart is U 9364, line 52) with which the extant text of Tablet XII begins. For, as Gadd has already pointed out (*RA* 30. 140 f.), Thompson incorrectly identified the first line of RM 964 which actually corresponds to line 4 of our restored passage, with the colophon of Tablet XI. The lines numbered 1-8 by Thompson (*EG* XII 68, cf. *ibid.* pl. 55) are really lines 4-11 of the tablet (for the restoration of the verb in line 11, cf. note 115). Moreover the lines numbered by Thompson as 10-13 are identical with his lines 5-9 (this, too, has already been recognized and noted by Gadd in *RA* 30. 140 f.), and are therefore to be omitted altogether.

The line *denkidu ana šašuma izakkara ana dgilgameš bêlišu*, which I have placed in brackets between lines 5 and 6, is omitted by the scribe of RM 964 where it should have appeared between line 2 and 3. Note that this line is found in the corresponding Sumerian passage (U 9364, line 50); the scribe of RM 964 may, therefore, have used a Sumerian version which omitted the line, just as, for example, the crucial sentence dgilgameš-e en-ki-du$_{10}$-ra gù mu-na-dé-e, which corresponds to line 9 of our restored passage (RM 964, line 6 = *EG* XII 6; also K 2774, line 2 = *EG* XII 11) is omitted in U 9364, but has now been found in three of its duplicates; cf. note 104.

[114] The Sumerian lines corresponding to lines 12-27 (*EG* XII 14-29) are U 9364, lines 57-73; for the Sumerian lines corresponding to lines 28-9 (*EG* XII 30-1), cf. note 105, and note that the text of line 29 presupposes a Sumerian variant not yet extant. Cf. the same note for an attempt to get at the meaning of lines 26-29 (*EG* XII 28-31).

[115] The Sumerian counterpart for line 30 (*EG* XII 32) reads: en-[ki-du$_{10}$-e] inim-lugal-la-na-šè nu-um-BU 'Enkidu heeded not the word of his lord' (CBS 19950, UM 29-15-993); the Semitic line is therefore to be restored to read: *ana aširti bêlišu ul išdud* 'he heeded not the instructions of his lord' (note this idiomatic intransitive use of *šadâdu* instead of the transitive *amâta ana libbi šadâdu*). It is this line which enables us to restore line 11 (*EG* XII 13) as *ana aširtiša lû tašdud*, although the extant corresponding Sumerian has a variant reading (with a similar meaning, however) consisting of two lines; cf. note 105, and particularly its reference to *BASOR* 79. 25, note 25.

[116] For details cf. note 106. According to our extant Sumerian texts, Gilgameš makes his plea only before Enlil and Enki, not, as in the Semitic version, before Sin, too. Once again it seems that our Semitic scribe used a slightly varying Sumerian text; cf. notes 114, 115.

[117] Cf. note 113.

[118] The text of the 'twelfth' tablet, a slavish copy of the Sumerian original, presents an interesting contrast to the first eleven tablets, whose Sumerian sources can scarcely be recognized, so thoroughly have they been modified and recast by their Babylonian borrowers.